



**Texas Department of Insurance**  
**Division of Workers' Compensation**  
Medical Fee Dispute Resolution, MS-48  
7551 Metro Center Drive, Suite 100 • Austin, Texas 78744-1609

## MEDICAL FEE DISPUTE RESOLUTION FINDINGS AND DECISION

### PART I: GENERAL INFORMATION

Requestor Name and Address:  HARRIS METHODIST HEB 3255 WEST PIONEER PARKWAY ARLINGTON TX 76013	MFDR Tracking #: M4-06-3803-01
	DWC Claim #:
	Injured Employee:
Respondent Name and Box #:  ACE AMERICAN INSURANCE CO Box #: 15	Date of Injury:
	Employer Name:
	Insurance Carrier #:

### PART II: REQUESTOR'S POSITION SUMMARY

**Requestor's Rationale for Increased Reimbursement:** "Cambridge took a CPS reduction on these therapy charges. When we called to see what a CPS reduction was we were told to call Concentra. When concentra was called we were told that the reduction was taken because Concentra audited the bill. We were told they always take a reduction because they audited the bill. We are asking that the hospital be reimbursed the CPS reduction. We turned in a reconsideration to Cambridge for this and received a fax talking about APC's. Concentra did not state this was a ppo discount or usual and customary charge."

**Amount in Dispute:** \$3,144.51

### PART III: RESPONDENT'S POSITION SUMMARY

**Respondent's Position Summary:** The respondent did not submit a response to this request for medical fee dispute resolution.

### PART IV: SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

Date(s) of Service	Denial Code(s)	Disputed Service	Amount in Dispute	Amount Due
2/7/2005 Thru 5/10/2005	L001, M, L002, C	Outpatient Rehabilitation Program	\$3,144.51	\$0.00
<b>Total Due:</b>				\$0.00

### PART V: REVIEW OF SUMMARY, METHODOLOGY AND EXPLANATION

Texas Labor Code §413.011(a-d), titled *Reimbursement Policies and Guidelines*, and Division rule at 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.1, titled *Use of the Fee Guidelines*, effective May 16, 2002 set out the reimbursement guidelines.

This request for medical fee dispute resolution was received by the Division on February 3, 2006. Pursuant to Division rule at 28 TAC §133.307(g)(3), effective January 1, 2003, 27 TexReg 12282, applicable to disputes filed on or after January 1, 2003, the Division notified the requestor on February 9, 2006 to send additional documentation relevant to the fee dispute as set forth in the rule.

- For the services involved in this dispute, the respondent reduced or denied payment with reason codes:
  - L001-M-No MAR
  - L002-C-Negotiated Contract Price
- The Respondent raised the issue of a negotiated contract price on the EOBs. A review of the submitted EOBs indicates that a \$1,302.96 CPS reduction was taken from the total charges. The requestor indicated that the CPS reduction was taken because Concentra audited the bill. Neither party submitted a copy of a contractual agreement to support this EOB denial; therefore, the disputed services will be reviewed in accordance with § Division rule at 28 TAC 134.401, §134.1 and Texas Labor Code §413.011(d).

3. Division rule at 28 TAC §134.401(a)(3), effective August 1, 1997, states in part “Services such as outpatient physical therapy, radiological studies, and laboratory studies are not covered by this guideline and shall be reimbursed at a fair and reasonable rate until the issuance of a fee guideline addressing these specific services.”
4. This dispute relates to outpatient rehabilitation services provided in a hospital setting with reimbursement subject to the provisions of Division rule at 28 TAC §134.1, effective May 16, 2002, 27 TexReg 4047, which requires that “Reimbursement for services not identified in an established fee guideline shall be reimbursed at fair and reasonable rates as described in the Texas Workers’ Compensation Act, §413.011 until such period that specific fee guidelines are established by the commission.”
5. Texas Labor Code §413.011(d) requires that fee guidelines must be fair and reasonable and designed to ensure the quality of medical care and to achieve effective medical cost control. The guidelines may not provide for payment of a fee in excess of the fee charged for similar treatment of an injured individual of an equivalent standard of living and paid by that individual or by someone acting on that individual’s behalf. It further requires that the Division consider the increased security of payment afforded by the Act in establishing the fee guidelines.
6. Division rule at 28 TAC §133.307(e)(2)(A), effective January 1, 2003, 27 TexReg 12282, applicable to disputes filed on or after January 1, 2003, requires that the request shall include “a copy of all medical bill(s) as originally submitted to the carrier for reconsideration...” Review of the documentation submitted by the requestor finds that the request does not include a copy of the medical bill(s) as submitted to the carrier for reconsideration. The Division concludes that the requestor has not met the requirements of Division rule at 28 TAC §133.307(e)(2)(A).
7. Division rule at 28 TAC §133.307(e)(2)(B), effective January 1, 2003, 27 TexReg 12282, applicable to disputes filed on or after January 1, 2003, requires that the request shall include “a copy of each explanation of benefits (EOB)... relevant to the fee dispute or, if no EOB was received, convincing evidence of carrier receipt of the provider request for an EOB.” Review of the documentation submitted by the requestor finds that the request does not include any reconsideration EOBs. Neither has the requestor submitted convincing evidence of carrier receipt of the provider request for a reconsideration EOB. The Division concludes that the requestor has not met the requirements of Division rule at 28 TAC §133.307(e)(2)(B).
8. Division rule at 28 TAC §133.307(g)(3)(A), effective January 1, 2003, 27 TexReg 12282, applicable to disputes filed on or after January 1, 2003, requires the requestor to send additional documentation relevant to the fee dispute including “documentation of the request for and response to reconsideration (when a provider is requesting dispute resolution on a carrier reduction or denial of a medical bill) or, if the carrier failed to respond to the request for reconsideration, convincing evidence of the carrier’s receipt of that request.” Review of the submitted evidence finds that the requestor has not provided documentation of the insurance carrier’s response to the request for reconsideration or convincing evidence of the carrier’s receipt of that request. The Division concludes that the requestor has not met the requirements of Division rule at 28 TAC §133.307(g)(3)(A).
9. Division rule at 28 TAC §133.307(g)(3)(B), effective January 1, 2003, 27 TexReg 12282, applicable to disputes filed on or after January 1, 2003, requires the requestor to send additional documentation relevant to the fee dispute including “a copy of any pertinent medical records.” Review of the documentation submitted by the requestor finds that the requestor has not provided medical records to support the services in dispute. The Division concludes that the requestor has not met the requirements of Division rule at 28 TAC §133.307(g)(3)(B).
10. Division rule at 28 TAC §133.307(g)(3)(C)(i), effective January 1, 2003, 27 TexReg 12282, applicable to disputes filed on or after January 1, 2003, requires the requestor to send additional documentation relevant to the fee dispute including a statement of the disputed issue(s) that shall include “a description of the healthcare for which payment is in dispute.” Review of the submitted documentation finds that the requestor did not provide a description of the healthcare for which payment is in dispute. The Division concludes that the requestor has not met the requirements of Division rule at 28 TAC §133.307(g)(3)(C)(i).
11. Division rule at 28 TAC §133.307(g)(3)(C)(iii), effective January 1, 2003, 27 TexReg 12282, applicable to disputes filed on or after January 1, 2003, requires the requestor to send additional documentation relevant to the fee dispute including a statement of the disputed issue(s) that shall include “how the Texas Labor Code and commission [now the Division] rules, and fee guidelines, impact the disputed fee issues.” Review of the submitted documentation finds that the requestor did not state how the Texas Labor Code and Division rules impact the disputed fee issues. The Division concludes that the requestor has not met the requirements of Division rule at 28 TAC §133.307(g)(3)(C)(iii).
12. Division rule at 28 TAC §133.307(g)(3)(C)(iv), effective January 1, 2003, 27 TexReg 12282, applicable to disputes filed on or after January 1, 2003, requires the requestor to send additional documentation relevant to the fee dispute including a statement of the disputed issue(s) that shall include “how the submitted documentation supports the requestor position for each disputed fee issue.” Review of the submitted documentation finds that the requestor did not state how the submitted documentation supports the requestor’s position for each disputed fee issue. The Division concludes that the requestor has not met the requirements of Division rule at 28 TAC §133.307(g)(3)(C)(iv).
13. Division rule at 28 TAC §133.307(g)(3)(D), effective January 1, 2003, 27 TexReg 12282, applicable to disputes filed on or after January 1, 2003, requires the requestor to provide “documentation that discusses, demonstrates, and justifies

that the payment amount being sought is a fair and reasonable rate of reimbursement.” Review of the submitted documentation finds that:

- The requestor’s rationale for increased reimbursement from the *Table of Disputed Services* states that “Cambridge took a CPS reduction on these therapy charges. When we called to see what a CPS reduction was we were told to call Concentra. When concentra was called we were told that the reduction was taken because Concentra audited the bill. We were told they always take a reduction because they audited the bill. We are asking that the hospital be reimbursed the CPS reduction. We turned in a reconsideration to Cambridge for this and received a fax talking about APC’s. Concentra did not state this was a ppo discount or usual and customary charge.”
- The requestor has not articulated a methodology under which fair and reasonable reimbursement should be calculated.
- The requestor does not discuss or explain how payment of \$3,144.51 would result in a fair and reasonable reimbursement.
- The requestor did not submit documentation to support that the payment amount being sought is a fair and reasonable rate of reimbursement.
- The requestor does not discuss or explain how payment of the requested amount would ensure the quality of medical care, achieve effective medical cost control, provide for payment that is not in excess of a fee charged for similar treatment of an injured individual of an equivalent standard of living, consider the increased security of payment, or otherwise satisfy the requirements of Texas Labor Code §413.011(d) or Division rule at 28 TAC §134.1.

The request for additional reimbursement is not supported. Thorough review of the documentation submitted by the requestor finds that the requestor has not demonstrated or justified that payment of the amount sought would be a fair and reasonable rate of reimbursement for the services in dispute. Additional payment cannot be recommended.

14. The Division would like to emphasize that individual medical fee dispute outcomes rely upon the evidence presented by the requestor and respondent during dispute resolution, and the thorough review and consideration of that evidence. After thorough review and consideration of all the evidence presented by the parties to this dispute, it is determined that the submitted documentation does not support the reimbursement amount sought by the requestor. The Division concludes that this dispute was not filed in the form and manner prescribed under Division rules at 28 Texas Administrative Code §133.307(e)(2)(A), §133.307(e)(2)(B), §133.307(g)(3)(A), §133.307(g)(3)(B), §133.307(g)(3)(C), and §133.307(g)(3)(D). The Division further concludes that the requestor failed to support its position that additional reimbursement is due. As a result, the amount ordered is \$0.00.

#### PART VI: GENERAL PAYMENT POLICIES/REFERENCES

Texas Labor Code §413.011(a-d), §413.031 and §413.0311  
28 Texas Administrative Code §133.307, §134.1, §134.401  
Texas Government Code, Chapter 2001, Subchapter G

#### PART VII: DIVISION DECISION

Based upon the documentation submitted by the parties and in accordance with the provisions of Texas Labor Code §413.031, the Division has determined that the requestor is not entitled to additional reimbursement for the services involved in this dispute.

#### DECISION:

_____	_____	9/9/2010
Authorized Signature	Medical Fee Dispute Resolution Officer	Date

#### PART VIII: YOUR RIGHT TO REQUEST AN APPEAL

Either party to this medical fee dispute has a right to request an appeal. A request for hearing must be in writing and it must be received by the DWC Chief Clerk of Proceedings within **20** (twenty) days of your receipt of this decision. A request for hearing should be sent to: Chief Clerk of Proceedings, Texas Department of Insurance, Division of Workers Compensation, P.O. Box 17787, Austin, Texas, 78744. **Please include a copy of the Medical Fee Dispute Resolution Findings and Decision** together with other required information specified in Division rule at 28 TAC §148.3(c).

Under Texas Labor Code §413.0311, your appeal will be handled by a Division hearing under Title 28 Texas Administrative Code Chapter 142 Rules if the total amount sought does not exceed \$2,000. If the total amount sought exceeds \$2,000, a hearing will be conducted by the State Office of Administrative Hearings under Texas Labor Code §413.031.

**Si prefiere hablar con una persona en español acerca de ésta correspondencia, favor de llamar a 512-804-4812.**